

THE  
Teaching Quakers  
NOT  
INSPIRED:  
OR, THEIR  
COMMON PRETENCES  
TO  
INSPIRATION  
PROVED  
Groundless and Vain.  
IN A  
DIALOGUE

BETWEEN A  
*Minister and his Parishioner.*

Designed for the Use of the Common  
People, especially of those that are in  
Danger of being seduced by these false  
Teachers.

IN WHICH  
Their PRETENCES to the being Baptized  
with the Holy Ghost and with Fire are ex-  
ploded; and their OBJECTIONS, from several  
Texts of Scripture against Water-Baptism,  
Answer'd.

---

*By a Minister of the Church of ENGLAND.*

---

Deutr. 18. 20. But the Prophet which shall presume to speak a Word  
in my Name, which I have not commanded him to speak,-- even  
that Prophet shall dye.

Matth. 6. 23. If the Light that is in thee be Darkness, how great is  
that Darkness?

---

LONDON: Printed for H. Clements at the Half-Moon in  
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1710.

Zinzano

CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE CITY OF LONDON

OF THE PARISH OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE DISTRICT OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE CITY OF LONDON

OF THE PARISH OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE DISTRICT OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE CITY OF LONDON

OF THE PARISH OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE DISTRICT OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE CITY OF LONDON

OF THE PARISH OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE DISTRICT OF ST. MARTIN

IN THE CITY OF LONDON

OF THE PARISH OF ST. MARTIN



I

Mi  
ster

AF  
if  
yo  
an  
to  
aly



THE  
Teaching Quakers  
NOT INSPIRED:  
Or, their  
COMMON PRETENCES  
TO  
INSPIRATION  
PROVED  
Groundless and Vain.

*Mini-  
ster.*

**N** Neighbour! I am glad to meet you: But pray give me leave to ask you how it came to pass you was not at Church this Afternoon? I hope your Family is well; and if no Works of Necessity or Charity prevented your coming, I must be plain with you, and tell you, this Neglect is sinful, and ought to be repented of. And let me desire you always to remember, that to omit any Duty,

when you may and ought to perform it, is to sin against God.

*Neighbour.* Why, Sir, I was there in the Morning, and hope that is sufficient, and no more Absolutely required of me.

*Minist.* Believe me, that is a very great Mistake, and, that you may see it is so, pray consider why you thought your self obliged to go to Church in the Morning?

*Neighbb.* Because this is the Christian-Sabbath; and as I am commanded to keep it holy, so I know no better way of doing it, than by worshipping God in his holy Assemblies, and therefore I never miss of going once, at least, in the Day to my Parish Church.

*Minist.* But is not the Afternoon part of the Sabbath, as well as the Morning? And why then do you not think your self bound to keep one part of the Sabbath holy, and in the same manner holy, as you do the other?

*Neighbb.* I must own I cannot altogether justify my self in this Matter, and was there a Sermon in the Afternoon, as there is in the Morning, I believe I should come oftner.

*Minist.* But why so? is it not your Duty to offer up your Prayers and Praises to God, as well as to hear the Word of God preached to you?—Besides, I must observe to you, that as you have the Church-Catechism expounded to you in the Afternoon, you may ordinarily reap as much Benefit from that, as you do from the Sermon in the Morning.

*Neighbb.* I thought that Exercise had been only designed for Children.

*Minist.* I know it is often thought so by those that most stand in need of it; but in the Exposition of the Catechism, you have all the Doctrines



doctrines and Precepts of the Christian Religion briefly and plainly laid before you. In a Sermon these are very commonly better recommended by Motives and Arguments, but in expounding the Catechism they are best explained. And as there was perhaps never more Ignorance (since the Reformation) amongst the meaner sort of People, so these Expositions were never more wanted, especially in Country-Congregations.

*Neighbb.* Perhaps then I may come to hear you expound next Sunday; but I must confess that I have been, this Day, at the Quakers Meeting.

*Minist.* I am sorry to hear it. I hope you do not design to turn Quaker: You was always bred up in the good old Religion of the Church of *England*; and if you should now change a true Religion for a false one, how dreadful would your Condition be! When a Man once thinks of chusing his Religion, he ought then, if ever, to consider what he is doing; in as much as his Salvation or Damnation depends upon his Choice. No worldly Interest, no Favour or Affection, or having any Man's Person in Admiration, should then have the least Influence upon him; but it behoves him to have his Conscience well informed, and to follow it without any Reserve whatsoever.

*Neighbb.* But, before you go any farther, pray give me leave to ask you one Question: Do not you think all Christians, of all Sects, may be saved, if they serve God faithfully in their own way? And if so, where would be the harm of it, if I should turn Quaker, and live according to my Principles?

*Minist.*

*Minist.* Alas! this is a very strange Notion: How could such a thought ever enter your Head? Do you believe there is no more necessary to Salvation than a good moral Life? If so, an honest Heathen might have as good a Title to be saved as a good Christian.

*Neighbb.* But is not a good Life the main?

*Minist.* A good Life is necessary to Salvation, and so is a good Faith; *For without Faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. 11. 6. *And he that believeth not shall be damned*, Mark 16. 16.

*Neighbb.* What then shall we say concerning those, that have erred even from the Fundamental Principles of the Christian Faith?

*Minist.* If they did this ignorantly, and their Ignorance was no way wilful in them; if they did not through Prejudice or Obstinacy refuse the Means of coming to the Knowledge of the Truth; we may charitably hope, that God by an uncovenanted Mercy may pardon the Errors of such unhappy People. But to be of an Opinion, that all Sects of Christians in general shall be saved according to the Gospel-Covenant, however they may differ in the Fundamental Articles of Faith or Practice; is to maintain, that instead of one Faith there are many, instead of one Hope there are many Hopes of our Calling; even as many as there are such Sects of Christians in the World.

*Neighbb.* But is not this, on the other Hand, to condemn all that do not believe as you do?

*Minist.* No, Neighbour, I condemn no one; I am only telling you what are the Terms and Conditions of the Gospel-Covenant; and you and all must know, that the Christians Salvation depends upon those two great Principles, *Faith and Repentance. Repent and believe the Gospel*



## ( 7 )

*Gospel*, was the preaching of our Saviour, *Mark* 1. 15. And sure I am, if any Belief is necessary to Salvation, it must be a true Orthodox Belief; and no other Belief can profit us any thing; I mean, so as to give us a fœderal Right to the Promises of the Gospel.

*Neighb.* But, in short, do you not believe there are good People of all sorts?

*Minist.* If by good you mean sincere well-meaning People, I confess I believe there are such, of all Religions, in the World. But still, he only is a true Christian that lives in the true Faith and Practice of Christianity. And if you will believe *St. Peter, Acts 4. 12, Neither is there Salvation in any other (but Christ) for there is none other Name under Heaven, given among Men, whereby we must be saved\**.

*Neighbb.* Well then, we will let that pass: And supposing I do not turn Quaker, I hope I may sometimes hear their famous Teachers without doing amiss?

*Minist.* No: I am positively of the Opinion you cannot.

*Neighbb.* But pray why? Sure there is no harm in going to hear that which is good.

*Minist.* Yes, there may be; for first, suppose the Quakers preach the same Religion as we of the Church of *England* do (which for the present we will take for granted to be the true Religion of Christ) yet, by going to hear them, you encourage Divisions among Christians; and if such Divisions are Evil, the encouraging of them must be likewise Evil: And now, that they are Evil, we may learn from the Mischief of Divisions in all Bodies and Societies of Men

---

\* See the 18th. Article of the Church of *England*.

in general; from that Maxim of our Saviours, *A House divided against itself cannot stand*; from his earnest and most affectionate Prayers to his Father, for his Disciples, *That they may be one, even as we are one.* And from that solemn Adjuration of St. Paul to the Corinthians, *1 Ep. I. 10. Now I beseech you, Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus, that ye all speak the same thing, that there be no Divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joyned together in the same Mind and the same Judgment.* But besides this, besides the Evil of encouraging Divisions amongst Christians, if on the other Hand these Men do preach up false Doctrines (as I shall prove hereafter) then by going to hear them you run into the way of Temptation, and are in Danger of being seduced by them; and if God should give you up to the Spirit of Error, you have nothing to blame but your own Rashness and Presumption.

*Neighbb.* But to come closer to the Point, and to tell you my Mind more freely: I cannot but think these Persons, whom you so much condemn, are endued with some extraordinary Gifts; and if they do speak, as the Spirit gives them utterance, certainly every one ought to be very desirous of hearing such inspired Teachers.

*Minist.* That is most certain; but what Reason have you to think they are thus inspir'd?

*Neighbb.* Why, in the first Place they are very positive of it; They commonly begin their Preachments with assuring us they are actually moved by the Spirit; that what they speak is not owing to long Study and Meditation, but springs up in their Minds, without their considering before-hand what they should say.

*Minist.*



*Minist.* But do not you consider that you have only their own Word for all this, and that you may, upon as good Grounds, believe every Pretender to Inspiration?

*Neighbb.* That is very true. But besides this, their manner of preaching is very extraordinary; for they always preach without Book, and with a great deal of Vehemence and Earnestness, much greater than is usual to Men speaking their own Thoughts; and this farther inclines me to believe what they say, that they do indeed speak as they are moved by the Holy Ghost.

*Minist.* I believe what you say is, in Truth, the Thoughts of most People that admire these new Teachers: But certainly, the Reasons you give for believing them inspired, are too weak to build such a Belief upon.—Had the Apostles of old nothing else to prove their Inspiration, but their preaching without Book, and with a great deal of Vehemence and Earnestness, one could never have much blamed the Jews, for not believing they were sent by God.

*Neighbb.* Why, what Method did they take to prove their Mission?

*Minist.* You may remember, Neighbour, that God gave them the Gift of Tongues, Power to cast out Devils, to raise the Dead, to cure the Lame and the Blind with a Word; and these were undeniable Evidences, that God sent them to preach a new Religion to the World.

*Neighbb.* But will you not believe any Man to be inspired upon less Evidence than this?

*Minist.* No, (especially considering the present State of Religion) I think I ought not. Nor do I conceive that that Demand the Jews made upon our Saviour, was any ways unreasonable;

when they answer'd and said, *What Sign shewest thou unto us, seeing thou dost these things?* John 2. 18. Because it is my Opinion, when God speaks by any one, in an extraordinary way, he will enable him to prove it in an extraordinary manner. And thus he did by *Moses* when he sent him to *Pharaoh*, and by the Prophets and Apostles.——But what has the Quaker, to make a reasonable Man believe that he does not speak his own Thoughts, but only what the Spirit of God puts into his Mind? Why, you tell me first that he preaches without Book; And is not this a notable Argument to prove his Inspiration? For the same Reason, a Papist, a Presbyterian, Anabaptist Teacher; nay, some Church of *England* Ministers, (for some of them there are, that have the Faculty of extemporary preaching) any of these, I say, may for the same Reason be looked upon as inspired Men.

*Neighb.* Why, do the *Popish Priests* preach without Book?

*Minist.* Yes; and much after the same manner; and with the same odd frantick Gestures as your Quaking Teachers do. And then, as for their Vehemence and Earnestness, their strange and ghastly Looks with which they preach and amuse the People; can any sober Man think that these are an Argument of their Inspiration?

—— The Priests that delivered the Heathen Oracles, were indeed agitated much after this manner; and I must own, I cannot but think of them, as often as I hear of the Extasies of your Teaching-Quakers, or our Modern Prophets. It was a sign the *Dæmon* was entered into the Man, when he began to rave, to foam at Mouth, to make a hideous Noise, and beat his



his swelling Breast; but that these should be looked upon as Signs of the good Spirit of God's entring into any one, is to me very surprizing.

*Neighb.* You must own that these Emotions are very extraordinary.

*Minist.* I own they are; but were they not as extraordinary in the Persons I just now mention'd? And yet I suppose you do not believe that those Heathen Priests spake from the Holy Ghost.

*Neighb.* And on the other Hand, I hope you do not imagine that the Quakers and Prophets are moved by an evil Spirit, by such a one as the Oracular Priests were?

*Minist.* I do not say so; but all that I affirm, is, that the Agitations of the one, and the odd violent Motions and tremblings of the other, used in their way of Teaching, are no Proof that either the one or the other are acted by the Spirit of God. And, to tell you the Truth, I think these strange Gestures would incline a Man to believe that both these sorts of People are rather acted by an *evil* than a good Spirit.

*Neighb.* Why so? methinks you carry the Matter too far.

*Minist.* Indeed Neighbour, I think not; because those Persons who had the Holy Ghost poured upon them, in the greatest Measure that ever Men had, never felt any of these Agitations and Emotions; but they that were of old acted by an evil Spirit, were moved much after the same manner as your Quakers and Prophets.

*Neighb.* Who do you mean by those that had so great a Portion of God's Spirit?

*Minist.* I mean the old Prophets, and Christ and his Apostles. And where do you find that these, either in their Prophecies or Sermons,

were ever acted like these new Pretenders to Inspiration, ever foamed and raved like them?

*Neighbb.* As for the Prophets let them answer for themselves. But I must tell you, Sir, tho' the Quakers do often beat their Breasts, and seem very much transported when they are *declaring*, yet you misrepresent them to say they foam, and rave, &c.

*Minist.* I believe they are pretty much come off from that extravagant sort of Behaviour, as they are from many other damnable Doctrines, which they are now ashamed of. But when the Quakers first appeared in the World, *viz.* about fifty or sixty Years ago, they went raving about the Streets, and acted when as they pretended the Spirit was coming upon them, altogether as extravagantly as I have represented. And this, they endeavour'd to make the World believe, was a plain Demonstration that they were sent from God, and acted by him.

*Neighbb.* I believe I have heard as much, and am sorry I have given you so much Trouble upon this Point; and to compound the Matter with you, if from the violent Tremblings and Agitations of the Teaching-Quakers you will not infer, they are acted by an evil Spirit, I will be as fair with you, and own that these are no Proof they are acted by a good Spirit.

*Minist.* I wish they that follow the New Prophets would do the same: For since they have most shamefully abused the World with their false Predictions, and pretended Miracles; I think their greatest Pretences to Inspiration are from their Agitations. But since you are willing to drop this Discourse I will say no more of it.

*Neighbb.*



*Neighb.* But, Sir, if you will not allow the manner of the Quakers teaching to be a Proof of their Inspiration, pray what think you of the Matter of their Discourses, which to me seems very extraordinary; especially considering their Teachers are Men of little or no Learning, and being generally employed in Trades and worldly Business, have no leisure to study and improve themselves by reading?

*Minist.* Why, to deal plainly with you, honest Neighbour, I have the same thoughts of the matter as I had of the manner of their teaching; and that is so far from proving they are inspired, that I think it to be a plain Proof that they are not.

*Neighb.* Nay, I perceive you are strangely prejudiced against this People; did you ever hear any of their Teachers?

*Minist.* I own I have not of late.

*Neighb.* How then can you speak so positively in this Case?

*Minist.* You shall have my Reasons by and by; and in the mean time I promise you, not to urge any thing against the Matter of these Men's Discourses to their Hearers, but what you your self shall first own to be true.

*Neighb.* Pray then proceed.

*Minist.* I will: But first, Neighbour, let me ask you one Question, Do these Teaching Quakers preach any other Doctrines, than what are to be found in the Scriptures?

*Neighb.* Why do you ask me this Question?

*Minist.* Because I think a great deal turns upon it. For first, if they preach any other Doctrines, as necessary to Salvation, I think it must be confessed that they preach another Gospel: And then remember what the Apostle  
says,

says, *Gal. 1. 8. Though we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than what you have received, let him be accursed.* — But if on the other Hand they do not preach any other Doctrines than what are to be found in the Scripture; I hope you will allow that there is no Necessity of their being inspired; that they, or any one else, may preach the same Doctrines as they do, without it. And now having given you the Reason of my Question, I expect your Answer.

*Neighbb.* But in truth I scarcely know what Answer to give you: However, for the present, we will suppose that the Quakers preach no other Doctrines, as necessary to Salvation, than what are revealed in the Scriptures.

*Minist.* Why then I hope you will draw the same Conclusion that I did, namely, that there is no necessity of their being inspired.

*Neighbb.* But what if there is not? Does it from thence follow that they are not inspired, because there is no necessity of their being so?

*Minist.* I do not say it does most certainly follow; yet I think it being needless, or not necessary, is a very probable Argument against their Inspiration.

*Neighbb.* Why may not God, out of his abundant Goodness, do many things for us that are not absolutely necessary?

*Minist.* Yes, Neighbour, I not only own that he may, but that he very often does so: But then let me tell you, that he very rarely does any thing in an extraordinary way, which may be as well done in an ordinary one; that is, he seldom does any thing without the use of means, which may be as well done with and by them. And if you observe this, you will  
gene-



generally find it true, in the whole Course of Nature and Providence.

*Neighb.* But how do you apply this to the Case in Hand?

*Minist.* Why, briefly thus: That since Men may come to the Knowledge of the Truth, and qualifie themselves for preaching the Gospel by the use of means; *i. e.* by reading and studying the Scripture. 'Tis very improbable that God should bring them to these important Truths, in an extraordinary way, or by an immediate Act of Inspiration. And therefore to conclude this Argument; it not being necessary that the Quakers should be inspired, to qualifie them for the preaching the Gospel, I think is a very good Argument that they are not.

*Neighb.* But did not Christ thus command his Disciples, *Take no thought how, or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say, and promise then, The Holy Ghost shall teach you, in that same Hour, what you shall say?* And why may not the Ministers of the Gospel expect to have this Promise fulfilled to them, as it was to the Disciples?

*Minist.* Because their Case and ours is extremely different: They had neither the same Books, nor the same Leisure to read and fit themselves for preaching and defending the Religion of Christ as we have; nay, they were altogether destitute of both of them; no Book of the New Testament was then in Being. And yet the Persons of whom you speak were to preach and plant the Gospel in all the World: And therefore, as they could not prepare themselves for this Work, by the use of means, God was pleased to assist them in an extraordinary manner, and give them that extraordinary Promise above-mentioned.

*Neighb.*

*Neighb.* I confess their Circumstances and ours are very different.

*Minist.* So different, that in my Opinion the Children of *Israel* might have as well expected to be fed with Bread from Heaven, when they came into the fruitful Land of *Canaan*, as any Christian, in this great Light of the Gospel, to be taught the first Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, by an immediate Act of Inspiration.

*Neighb.* Well then, because you shall have no Occasion to say that I am obstinately resolved to defend my own Opinion, right or wrong, I will own that any diligent Reader of the Scriptures may, from them, learn the necessary Parts of the Christian Religion. And therefore, that as there is no Necessity of any one's being taught them by Inspiration, so there is as little probability they should spring up miraculously, in any Man's Mind whatsoever.

*Minist.* I thank you for this Concession; and I hope you are now of the same Opinion with me, *viz.* That the Quakers are not actually and immediately taught of God, what they should say when they hold forth in their Congregations; and that therefore they miserably impose upon their Hearers by pretending to it.

*Neighb.* No, no, Sir, I cannot as yet see any Necessity of owning half so much as this comes to. For tho' I do allow that the Quakers do, or may learn the Principles of the Christian Religion from Scripture, yet I cannot see how such illiterate Men should preach these Doctrines so plainly, so movingly, and affectionately, even to the exceeding the most studied Discourses, without some extraordinary Assurances.

*Minist.*



*Minist.* I stand amazed, Neighbour! to hear that you, who seem to be a Man of Reason and Religion, should give such a Character of these Mens Discourses; nay, to have such an Opinion of them, as to conclude from hence they must certainly be inspired. — Do you believe, when Christ made that excellent Discourse contained in the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> Chapters of St. *Matthew*, that he was then endued with a wonderful Portion of God's Spirit?

*Neighbb.* Yes, no doubt of it; when I read those Chapters I perceive such pure, divine, and heavenly Notions of Morality, in every Verse, that I cannot doubt who was the Author of them.

*Minist.* You pass a very just Judgment upon those holy Writings; and now pray compare them with your Quakers Preachments: Do you find there is any likeness between them? any thing that should incline one to believe that Christ and the Quakers spake by the same Spirit? For observe with what odd Tautologies, with what vain Repetitions, with what impertinent foolish Exclamations of *Ob Friends!* *Ab Friends!* and *Friends ab!* do your Quakers Discourses generally abound? Whereas in the other you find nothing but the most perfect Precepts of Morality, delivered in the shortest, plainest, most unaffected, comprehensive Stile.

*Neighbb.* What you urge is undoubtedly true; there is no Similitude of Stile or Expression between the Quakers Discourses and the Discourses of Christ and his Apostles.

*Minist.* And what Reason then has one to imagine, that they spake by and from the same Spirit? Is it probable that the Holy Ghost should speak by the one, in such a serious, aw-  
C ful,

ful, and majestic Stile; and by the other, in such a loose, trifling manner, as even a wise Man would be ashamed of?

*Neighb.* But by your Leave, Sir, may not the same Spirit move Men to speak in very different Stiles, according to the different Capacities and Inclinations of those that hear them?

*Minist.* Yes, it may be so; but you can never imagine, but when God sends any Preacher of Righteousness, that he should qualify and enable him to preach in the most rational, convincing, edifying manner.

*Neighb.* No doubt of it; and I cannot but still think the Quakers the most edifying Teachers that I ever heard.

*Minist.* That's strange! Methinks you should like those Discourses best that come nearest in Stile and Expression to the Discourses of Christ and his Apostles, as being certainly the best Examples one can write or speak after. But however, by edifying I suppose you mean instructive Discourses.

*Neighb.* Yes.

*Minist.* Now pray consider how you have been at any time instructed by the Quakers: Did you ever hear them plainly and clearly explain to you the Doctrines of Christ's Religion? Such as concern the Person of Christ, declaring and proving who and what he was before he came into the World, and what after? Why he suffered the cursed Death of the Cross, and what he is now doing for us at the Right Hand of God? Did you ever hear them, I say, teaching these important Doctrines, proving the Truth of them, pressing the Necessity of believing these or any other Articles of Faith? Or farther, Do they at any time teach you where-



in those great Virtues consist of Justice, Humility, Charity, forgiving of Enemies, or the like? Or lastly, how you may perform and finish that necessary Work of Repentance? Pray consider, Neighbour, and tell me sincerely, whether you ever heard any of these Points in Divinity fully and clearly made out to you in the Quakers Meetings?

*Neighbb.* Indeed I cannot say that I have; their Teachers do sometimes indeed speak in general of these Matters, and say we must believe and repent; bidding us mind the Lord, and follow the Light within us; but what we are to believe, and what is the true Nature of Repentance, I think I never heard clearly stated by any of them.

*Minist.* But are not these the Subjects that ought to be chiefly insisted on in Christian Congregations? Is it not by preaching up these saving Doctrines that the Ministers of the Gospel are to edify the Body of Christ?

*Neighbb.* I cannot think otherwise.

*Minist.* And yet I believe you must own that a Man may hear the Quakers for twenty Years together, and after all, continue ignorant of what it most concerns him, to know and believe as a Christian; and can you then any longer call these edifying Teachers? and think they must needs be inspired, because they preach so much to the Edification of the People?

*Neighbb.* I know not whence it is; but this I know, that I am never so much affected with any one's teaching as I am with theirs.

*Minist.* I wonder at it; and if I can guess at the Reason, it must be this, That you are imposed upon by the manner of their Preaching. They seem themselves to be extremely moved

and affected with what they say, to be very much in earnest, and under strange Agonies when they are speaking to you: And this working upon your Imagination deceives your Judgment, and makes you blindly believe there must be a great deal of Religion and Piety in what is delivered with so much Passion, Concern, and Zeal,

*Neighb.* I believe there may be something of Truth in what you say.

*Minist.* Nay, Neighbour, it cannot be otherwise; for if after you have been most affected and moved with hearing these Men, you would but go home, and seriously consider what great Matters you have heard, what Portions of Scripture explained and pressed upon you, what Arguments for a good and holy Life, or what Parts of the Christian Faith laid open before you; I am persuaded you would find so little of this Nature in their best Discourses that you would wonder at your self how you came to be so much affected with them.

*Neighb.* Well, if ever I go to hear the Quakers again, I will remember as well as I can what you have said upon the Matter and Manner of their Preaching.

*Minist.* And when you are there (if the Fear of falling into so great a Snare cannot prevent your going) let me beseech you to endeavour not to be imposed upon by their vain Repetitions, and abundance of affected Noise and Action.

Regard not, if it be possible, their seeming Zeal, but mind what they say; weigh every Sentence; and consider whether you can think the Great and All-wise God did ever of old, or would now speak thus to his People? That  
the



the Spirit of Wisdom would ever utter such odd, rambling, indigested Notions, as I am persuaded you generally hear in the Quakers Meetings.

For you must observe, (if their Teachers do not deceive you) that it is not Man, but the Eternal Spirit of God that then speaks to you; 'tis that infinite Spirit that speaks by and through them. So that if you shall at any time hear any thing from these Men, unworthy of that divine Spirit, you must look upon the proud Boastings of their Inspiration to be vain and impudent, and highly dishonourable to that God, who (as they would make the World believe) dictates to them all they say and preach in their Meetings.

*Neighb.* I must own, indeed, I have sometimes heard a great deal of sorry Stuff, from their She-Teachers especially; and to deal plainly with you, even the best of them are too much given to Railing, especially against the Priests, whom I have often heard them call Baal-Priests, dumb Dogs, Hirelings, and the like. But what has given me the greatest Offence, has been their speaking so disrespectfully of the Scriptures, and contemptuously of the Sacraments; calling the one, a dead Letter, Serpents Food, a rotten Foundation; and the other, beggarly Elements, &c.

*Minist.* And yet I suppose those Persons (whom you so justly condemn) pretended to be as much moved by the Spirit as your other Teaching-Quakers.

*Neighb.* Yes, I believe they did.

*Minist.* Is it not then very evident, that you were either very grossly abused by these Teachers, that they told you they were moved by  
the

the Spirit, when they were not? Or that all that Railing, those opprobrious and contemptuous Speeches of the Scriptures and Sacraments must be charged upon the good Spirit of God? which is certainly no less than downright Blasphemy to imagine.

*Neighbb.* But I hope you will not condemn a whole Sect of People, for the sake of some few rash and inconsiderate Teachers.

*Minist.* No, Neighbour; but yet I think it would make a Man very much mistrust all their Pretences to Inspiration; when one hears so many of their Teachers uttering such things, as it is impossible the holy Spirit of God should ever put into the Mind of Man. *For if Michael the Archangel durst not bring against the Devil himself a railing Accusation, Jude 9.* we can never imagine, that's God's Spirit should ever move and stir up Men to treat the Ministers of his Word, and the Word of God itself, in the most scurrilous and opprobrious manner.

*Neighbb.* Indeed I cannot but conclude the same; and do assure you, there are many of the Quakers that condemn this railing as much as you; and therefore let not that Charge be extended to the whole Sect of them.

*Minist.* But what think you of the Sacraments? You must own that these are condemned, and preached against, by all the Quakers in general.

*Neighbb.* That is very true; and I must confess I have often thought this one of the greatest Errors of the Quakers. For those two Commands, *Go and baptise all Nations, &c.* and *Do this in remembrance of me,* are, in my Opinion, as plain and positive as any in the whole Bible.

*Minist.*



( 23 )

*Minist.* And I think it is as plain that we are not mistaken in the Sense and meaning of them; for it is most certain, the Apostles of Christ baptised with Water, received the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, and preached up the necessity of so doing

*Neighb.* As for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, I am fully satisfied that Christ design'd it for a standing Ordinance in his Church: And I likewise believe the Quakers themselves will not deny that his Apostles baptised with Water.

*Minist.* No, they do not, for *Barclay*, p. 439. fairly owns, *That St. Peter did thus baptise Cornelius's Family.* And I think it is more plain, that *Philip* baptised the *Æthiopian Eunu*ch in the same manner. And must it not from hence follow, either that Water Baptism is the true Baptism, or that these Apostles, *Peter* and *Philip*, did not rightly baptise, that they were deceived themselves, and deceived others, in a Matter of the greatest Consequence? And upon the whole, (unless these Disciples knew Water Baptism not to be the true Baptism, at the same time they administred it,) that the Quakers do now understand the Mind of Christ better than they did, who lived, conversed with him, and were daily instructed by him?

*Neighb.* Your Conclusions are certainly very just and reasonable; for either *Peter* and *Philip*, or *George Fox* and Mr. *Barclay* are grievously mistaken; because their Practices and Opinions are directly contrary in this Case; for these Disciples of Christ baptised with Water, but those great Apostles of the Quakers do not. *St. Peter*, speaking of *Cornelius's Family*, says, *Who can forbid*

*forbid Water that these Persons should not be baptised; but the Quakers forbid Water Baptism in general, and call it a vain and idle Ceremony. — But I think I have heard the Quakers excuse themselves, by saying, What was proper to be done in the Apostles Days may not be so now; that the Apostles baptised with Water, to please the Jews, a People that had been long accustomed to Ceremonies; but since there is no such Reason for the use of Ceremonies now, this of Baptism, and that of the Lord's Supper, with all others, ought to be laid aside.*

*Minist.* But stay, Neighbour; if the Apostles Design, in baptising with Water, was only to please the Jews, why did they baptise their Heathen Converts? Or why did they not rather continue their old Rite of Circumcision? which was certainly more agreeable to the Jewish Nation than the new Ceremony of Baptism. Had there been no such Command as *Go and baptise, &c.* one might with much more Reason have imagined, that the Apostles instituted this Ordinance, perhaps, to please the Jews, if the Quakers would have it so: But since on the contrary, they were commanded to baptise, and, by their Practice, we find the Baptism administered by them was only that of Water Baptism; how can one doubt but what they did was in pursuance of Christ's Command, not upon any temporary Consideration whatsoever? Besides, if the Apostles did not baptise as they ought, when they baptised with Water, which way did they do it? What other Baptism was administered by them? Who did they baptise in any other manner?

*Neighb.*



*Neighb.* I cannot give you any direct Answer to these Questions; but the Quakers Answer in general, is, That the true Baptism is that of the Holy Ghost and with Fire; that Water Baptism is the Baptism of *John*, the other that of Christ.

*Minist.* It is not to be deny'd that *John* foretold, and Christ promised his Disciples, that they should be baptised with the Holy Ghost and with Fire. And it is as certain, that when the Day of Pentecost was fully come, the Holy Ghost did descend upon them in an extraordinary manner, and there appeared Cloven Tongues, like as of Fire, and it sat upon each of them, Acts 2. 3. But then, if Christ did design that all Christians should be thus baptised, if the Apostles were thus to baptise all Nations, how comes it to pass, that no Age, no History sacred or prophane, should give us the like Instance of any Persons being baptised, with the like wonderful Circumstances?

*Neighb.* Indeed I have often made the same Observation my self, viz. That never any Person, since the Apostle's Days, was baptized as they were. But the Quakers endeavour to avoid this Difficulty, by telling you, that the baptising with Fire is only a figurative Expression, signifying the purifying Effects of the Holy Spirit; and therefore by baptising with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, you are only to understand the being baptised with the Holy Ghost.

*Minist.* This they may say indeed, but upon what Reason or Authority I can't imagine. For it is certain the Apostles, to whom this Promise was made, were baptised both with the

D

Holy

Holy Ghost and with Fire. And since the baptising with Fire was then literally fulfilled, (and surely we may best learn from thence what that Baptism was) why must it be now supposed, that it was designed to be understood only in a mystical and figurative Sense? But in short, the Quakers must say this or nothing; for since they can never produce any one Instance, any one Person, since the Apostles Days, that was actually and literally baptised with Fire (or at least with something that resembled it) as they were; they must either lay aside that part of the Baptism, or never pretend that all Christians ought to be thus baptised.

*Neighb.* I am fully satisfy'd, in this Point, that what the Quakers call the Baptism of Christ, as it was miraculous in its Nature, so was it as peculiar to the Apostles, as the Gifts that were then bestowed upon them. That, for the Reason above-mention'd, this could not be that Baptism (no more than the Baptism of Martyrdom) which Christ ordained as a standing Ordinance in his Church; but that on the other Hand Water Baptism was appointed in common to all Christians; that it was so administer'd by the Apostles, and has been through all the Ages of the Christian Church. And farther, that it seems very unreasonable to me to imagine, that God should suffer the whole Church of Christ to be mistaken in a matter of so great Importance, that it should continue in this Error for more than 1600 Years; and that no one, in so many Ages, should find out and discover Christ's true Baptism, till the Quakers did it about sixty Years ago. And lastly, that there never should be, nor now is, any National



nal Church on Earth that rejects Water Baptism as the Quakers do.

*Minist.* I am heartily glad to hear you are of this Opinion, and the more, because I find you are furnished with so good Arguments for the Defence of it.

*Neighb.* I thank you, Sir, for that Compliment; but yet I must confess to you there are some Texts of Scripture, by which these Men endeavour to overthrow the use of Water Baptism, that I cannot so easily answer; and therefore, if you can spare time, and you do not think it too great a Digression from our present Purpose, pray do me the Favour to explain them more fully to me.

*Minist.* With all my Heart, Neighbour; and therefore propose them one after another, and begin with that which seems most difficult to you.

*Neighb.* Pray then, in the first Place, teach me to distinguish the Baptism now in use, from the Baptism of *John*; for the Quakers are certainly in the right of it, in saying, That Christ's and *John*'s Baptism are not the same: But since both we, and the Disciples of *John* were baptized with Water, I must own I am very much at a loss to shew how and wherein they differ.

*Minist.* Know then, Neighbour, that the Difference chiefly lies in the End and Design of them. The Disciples of Christ and *John* *Act 19. 4, 5.* were indeed both baptised with Water, but to very different Ends and Purposes. For *John*'s Baptism was (as St. *Luke* calls it) only a Baptism of Repentance; by which Men were stirred up to repent of their Sins, to wash and

purifie themselves from all Iniquity, that they might be made fit to be the Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, the Disciples of him that should come after *John*. But the baptising of Christians with Water was designed for better Purposes, by that we are baptised into the Faith of Christ, into *the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; by that we are made actual Disciples of Christ, Members of his Body, Partakers of his Sufferings, interested in all the Merits of his Death and Passion. But there was nothing of this in *John's* Baptism; *John's* Baptism was only preparatory to this. And hence it was, that those *Ephesian* Converts, mention'd *Acts* 19. 2, 3, &c. who had been only baptised into *John's* Baptism of Repentance, were afterwards baptised into the Name of the Lord Jesus. And give me leave to observe to you, from this Place, that that second Baptism of the *Ephesian* Disciples, which the Quakers own to be Christ's Baptism, was not that of the Holy Ghost and with Fire; because you may take notice, it is not said, The Holy Ghost came upon them when they were baptised into the Name of the Lord Jesus, but after they had been baptised, and when *St. Paul* had laid his Hands upon them, *i. e.* confirmed them, the Holy Ghost came upon them. So that there the coming of the Holy Ghost was certainly the Effect of their being confirmed, not of their being baptised.

*Neighb.* I perceive then, that tho' the outward sign was the same in both Baptisms, yet the thing signified by them was very different; that the baptising with Water was applied to one purpose in the Baptism of *John*,  
to



to another in the Baptism of Christ; and do from hence see how and wherein they differ. I proceed therefore, by your leave, to another Passage of Scripture, in which I have often heard the Quakers mightily triumph; 'tis 1 Cor. I. 17. where, say they, the Apostle positively declares that Christ sent him not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel; and that upon this Account he thanks God at the 14<sup>th</sup> Verse he had baptised so few as are there mentioned. And from hence they argue thus: That if *Paul* the Apostle of the Gentiles was not sent to baptise, that if he therefore thanks God that he had baptised very few of his *Corinthian* Converts, it must follow, that Water Baptism is not to be accounted the Badge of Christianity.

*Minist.* I must own this Passage does, at first sight, give some Countenance to the Quakers Opinion of Baptism; but first, suppose the Sense they put upon these Words was true and genuine, yet I think it evident from them, even so explained, that Water Baptism is no unlawful Rite or Ordinance; for if it was, *St. Paul* had more Reason to have humbled himself that he baptised any, than to thank God he had baptised so few. But to be more particular, I am verily persuaded the Quakers do perfectly mistake the Scope and Design of this Place, and draw very false Inferences from it. For observe, at the 11<sup>th</sup> Verse of this Chapter, he is there reproofing his *Corinthians*, for some Contentions that were then grown up amongst them, grounded, as appears from the 12<sup>th</sup> Verse, upon an unreasonable Distinction they had made amongst themselves, by saying,  
I am

*I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ.* The Folly of this he thus exposes at the 13<sup>th</sup> Verse, *Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptised in the Name of Paul?* And then it follows, at the 14<sup>th</sup> Verse, *I thank God I baptised none of you but Crispus and Gaius.* But why does St. Paul thank God for this? Was it because he thought Water Baptism an insignificant Ceremony? Does he say any thing that looks like this? No: This is a Reason altogether of the Quakers own inventing: For the Words that immediately follow are these, *lest any one should say I had baptised in my own Name:* Take then these two Verses together; *I thank God that I baptised none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any one should say I had baptised in my own Name;* and you will plainly see, that the Quakers give a very different Reason of St. Paul's thanking God he baptised so few, from what St. Paul himself does.

*Neighb.* But why then does he say, *that Christ sent him not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel?*

*Minist.* Because the preaching the Gospel was the chief end of his being sent; for these Words are not to be understood absolutely, as if baptising was no part of his Office; but his meaning is, *I was not only, or principally, sent to baptise, but chiefly to preach the Gospel.* After the same manner God expresses himself, *Hosea 6. 6. I desired Mercy, and not Sacrifice; i. e. not Sacrifice only, but likewise, and more principally, Mercy.* And in that Advice given to the Women, *1 Pet. 3. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting of Hair, of wear-*  
ing



*ing of Gold, or putting on Apparel, but let it be the hidden Man of the Heart :* There again, only is to be understood, for if not, if the Words are to be taken absolutely, some Persons may from hence conclude, they must put on no Apparel, and consequently go naked. And farther, tho' *Barclay* tells us, that the Exposition above-mentioned has no better Foundation than the Affirmation of the Assertors, yet it must be admitted, to make the Apostle act consistent with his Commission. For he might upon Occasion baptise some few of the *Corinthians*, tho' the preaching amongst them was his chief and principal Business. But if he was not sent at all to baptise (as the *Socinians* and *Quakers* interpret this Place) then it is plain the Apostle did more than he was sent for, more than he could justifie, or had Authority to do. But after all, it is not to be doubted, but the Office of baptising the *Corinthians* was performed by others; others were sent to baptise them, *St. Paul* to preach to them.

*Neighbb.* But how does that appear? If you could make that out as roundly as you assert it, I think it would very much back and strengthen your Interpretation of this Scripture. The Matter of Fact itself would make *St. Paul's* meaning very clear, and it would be no wonder that he should say *he* was not sent to baptise, if he knew others were employed in that Office.

*Minist.* For the clearing then, of this Matter, I must desire you to consult the 18<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*; where you will find that *St. Paul* having, at the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse, mention'd in particular the Conversion

version of *Crispus's* Family, says farther, *many of the Corinthians bearing, believed and were baptised.* Now if many believed, and as many were baptised, who baptised them? *St. Paul* did not, for he says he baptised *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and no one else (as he believes) besides *Stephanus's* Family. Since then, many more, besides those few of the *Corinthians*, were baptised, and *St. Paul* did not do it, it must be done by some other Persons; and unless the Quakers will suppose that those Persons did it, without being sent or commissioned to baptise, it must from hence follow, that the Ministry of Baptism was given to others; and, as I before said, others were sent to baptise, *St. Paul* chiefly to preach to them.

*Neighbb.* I find it is the safest way to explain one Text of Scripture by another; for the comparing those Words of *St. Paul*, to the *Corinthians*, with the Account he gives of the same Matter in the *Acts of the Apostles*, affords a great deal of Light in this Case: And I perceive the Quakers must either say, That *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and *Stephanus's* Family were the *many*, that *bearing believed*, and were *baptised*; (which I think very absurd;) or own more were baptised; and then that that Office was chiefly perform'd by another, not by *St. Paul*; who might therefore very well say, *I was not sent to baptise you*, (but some other Minister) my Business was principally to preach to you.

*Minist.* Indeed, Neighbour, I think you take the Matter very right, and I am persuaded this is the true Sense and meaning of the Apostle.

*Neighbb.*



*Neighb.* I shall proceed then to another Text of Scripture: I think it is in the *Hebrews*, by which the Quakers pretend, That that Apostle exhorts us to lay aside the Doctrine of Baptisms. If you remember any such Text pray give me your Sense of it.

*Minist.* I believe I know what you mean, and you will find this Text, *Hebr. 6. 12.* But upon my Word, Neighbour, I stand amazed that ever any well-meaning Person should pretend to prove, that Baptism ought to be laid aside, from a Place, where it is directly call'd a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ. The Words are these, *Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on to Perfection; not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God, of the Doctrine of \* Baptisms, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and eternal Judgment.* And now pray consider, are not all these Particular Doctrines here called the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ? And is not that of Baptism plainly reckoned amongst them? And then, is there not as much

---

\* Observe the Apostle speaks of Baptisms, in the plural Number, and therefore must be supposed to refer to more Baptisms than one; even those three Baptisms mentioned in Scripture, *viz.* The Baptism of Water, the Baptism of Blood or Martyrdom, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, call'd by the Schoolmen *Baptismus Fluminis, Sanguinis, & Flaminis*, the first founded upon *Acts 8. 38.* the second on *Matthew 20. 22, 23.* the third on *Matthew 3. 11.* What therefore the Apostle says of the Doctrine of Baptisms in general, must be applied to these three Baptisms in particular; and is as good an Argument for leaving the Doctrine of the Baptism by the Holy Ghost, as the Doctrine of the Baptism by Water.

E

Reason

Reason for laying aside one as the other, viz. *Repentance from dead Works, Faith towards God, Resurrection from the Dead, and Eternal Judgment*, as this particular Doctrine.

*Neighb.* The Case is too evident to be disputed, and I from hence see, how willing these Men are to pervert the Scriptures to their own Destruction; and shall therefore mention but one or two Texts more, and interrupt you no farther: The first is written 1 Pet. 3. 21. where the Quakers say we have the plainest Definition of Baptism in the whole Bible. The whole Verse runs thus, *The like Figure whereunto Baptism doth now save us (not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* And from hence they would conclude, that the true Baptism cannot be by Water, because the Apostle says, *it is not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh*, which must relate to the outward Ceremony of washing with Water.

*Minist.* This indeed looks something like an Objection; but have but a little Patience, and you shall plainly see, that this Text, as well as that above mention'd, is a very good Argument for Water Baptism.

For first, it is evident that Baptism is here said to save us, or to be a means of Salvation; but then the Question is, What sort of Baptism is this? Why 'tis such a one, says the Apostle, as appears from the Verse immediately before this, as was typified or represented by *Noah's Ark, where few, that is eight Souls, were saved by Water.* And what Baptism can you imagine this must be? the Baptism of the Holy Ghost



Ghost and with Fire, or the Baptism with Water? Surely, if there is any Propriety in Words, any Similitude between our Deliverance by Baptism, and *Noah* and his Family by the Ark, the Baptism that was figured by that must be a Water Baptism. But, say the Quakers, the Baptism that saves us, is not, or doth not consist in putting away the Filth of the Flesh; but if it was represented by Water, it must be a Water Baptism, at least not a Baptism by Fire; unless the Quakers can reconcile Fire and Water together, or shew any Similitude between them. And therefore I think the Sense of the Words is plainly this, The Baptism which was typified by *Noah's* Deliverance in the Ark, does also now save us as the Ark did him; but not merely as it is the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but as it is likewise the Answer of a good Conscience towards God; implying, that without this, in adult Persons, the outward washing or sprinkling with Water could be of no use.

*Neighbb.* I come now to the last Objection of the Quakers against Water Baptism, from *Gal.* 3. 27. where the Apostle says, *As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ*; from whence they conclude, that since it is evident, that many who are baptised with Water have not put on Christ, it must follow, that the baptising with Water is not the baptising into Christ.

*Minist.* The Force of this Objection, if I mistake not, lies in this, That all that are baptised with Water, do not live as Men that have put on Christ; but I believe the Quakers must own, that this would be as strong an Obje-

ction against their pretended inward spiritual Baptism, because it is evident, that several of their First-rate Quakers, for Gifts and seeming Holiness, have fell into grievous Crimes, and (as they call it) apostatised from them; and therefore the Lives of those great gifted Quakers must prove as much against their Baptism, as the Lives of wicked Christians against Water Baptism. But indeed, I think the Lives, neither of Christians nor Quakers, prove any thing at all in this Matter. For it does not follow, that Men did never put on Christ, because they do not live as becomes the Gospel of Christ. For they may have once put him on, and afterwards cast him off; like the Church of *Ephesus* they may fall from their first Love, and forfeit by their wicked Lives all the Privileges and Advantages of being made, by Baptism, a Member and Disciple of Christ.

*Neighbb.* I shall now be as good as my Word, and give you no farther Trouble, and am willing to hear what use you would make of the Quakers preaching down, and declaring against, the Sacrament of Baptism, as administered by Water.

*Minist.* The use I would make of it is this, That you, and all that own the divine Institution of the Christian Sacraments, and in particular of this *Of Baptism by Water*, should look upon the Teaching-Quakers as great Deceivers, as Impostors or Enthusiasts.

*Neighbb.* But why so?

*Minist.* Because I think it must be granted, that whoever under the Gospel Dispensation teaches any other Doctrine than that of Jesus Christ, or orders any thing contrary to its Principles,



ciples, is a false Teacher, and ought to be avoided. But the Quakers do this, in respect of the Sacraments, according to your own Concessions, and therefore I leave you to draw the Conclusion.

*Neighbb.* But are not all Men subject to Mistakes? And have not many learned Persons fallen into great and dangerous Errors, and yet, in the main, been accounted very good Men?

*Minist.* Yes, and they might be so for ought we know; and the Reason why we judge so charitably of them, is, because they only speak their own Judgments, which are fallible, and may be deceived.

*Neighbb.* Pray what do the Quakers do more?

*Minist.* You know they endeavour to impose their Notions upon the World, under the sacred Name and Authority of the Holy Ghost; for they tell you (as I before observed) that in all they declare in their Meetings, they are moved by the good Spirit of God; that they do not then speak their own Thoughts and Judgments, but what God puts in their Minds, and, as it were, dictates to them. And this, I say, none but an Impostor would assert, if he knew to the contrary; and none but an Enthusiast can be mistaken in.

*Neighbb.* But does this one Error of the Quakers prove they are not inspired?

*Minist.* I would not have you imagine, that this is the only Error of the Quakers: No, they are guilty of too many others; such as their pretending to sinless Perfection; their setting up the Light within them, above the glorious Light of the Gospel; and as a Consequence of that, their Boasting that what they teach in  
their

their Meetings, is of as great, if not ~~not~~ greater, Authority than the Writings of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke* and *John*. They have been likewise charged, and I believe upon too good Grounds, with denying that there is, or ever was, any other Christ but what is within them; and with many other damnable Doctrines. But as the Quakers in general (the new Quakers especially) do now disown some of these Tenets. And as there is no Error they all so unanimously agree in, as in this concerning Water Baptism, the great initiatory Christian Sacrament, so I have particularly insisted on that, being an Argument against the whole Sect of Quakers. And now, to give you a direct Answer to your Question, this one Error, relating to the Sacraments, is abundantly sufficient to prove their Teachers are not inspired. For if the Spirit of God cannot err, they who do err, who preach but one Doctrine for Truth, which is not so, cannot, at that time at least, be inspired. A good Man may err, but an inspired Man, under an immediate Act of Inspiration (as the Teaching-Quakers pretend to be) cannot. And therefore, if when you have heard them proudly boasting of their Inspiration, you shall, at the same time, be convinced that they preach but one Doctrine contrary to the Doctrine of Christ; I say you ought, for that Reason, to avoid them, as bold and dangerous Deceivers, who pretend to be acted by the Spirit of Truth, when they are indeed moved by the Spirit of Error. And, Neighbour, it would almost make a Man tremble, to consider how great a Sin these Men are guilty of. For Men to take upon them to preach the Religion of Christ, unless they are  
sent,



sent, *i. e.* called, and rightly ordained into that Holy Office, is a far greater Crime than some Persons imagine; but to sow Divisions among Christians, to preach up false Doctrines to them, and all this in the Name of God, as moved by his Eternal Spirit, is such an aggravated Sin, such a direct sinning against the Holy Ghost, that as it is not of the same Nature with that mentioned in the Gospel, so I wish it may be more pardonable.

*Neighb.* I am satisfied if these Teachers are not moved by the Spirit of God, their pretending to it must be a Sin of the deepest dye.

*Minist.* Then pray consider what has passed between us, upon this Subject, and God of his infinite Mercy bring you to the Knowledge of the Truth.

---

F I N I S.

---

**BOOKS Printed for and Sold by H. CLEMENTS at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-Yard.**

**T**HE Dissenters Represented and Condemn'd, by themselves, on the Points of the Vocation of their Ministry; the Constitution of their Churches, and their Separation from the Church of *England*. In a Letter of Mr. D. W. a Dissenting Teacher to one of his Flock, who went astray; together with some farther Account of their Principles and Practises upon those Points.

An Antidote against the pernicious Errors of the Anabaptists, or the Dipping Sect; wherein the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England*, in relation to Infants Baptism, are justify'd and confirm'd by Holy Scripture and Reason, by the approved Custom of Christians in all Ages, since the Apostles; and by the Judgment of all the Reform'd Churches of *Europe*; and wherein all Objections against it are fully answer'd.

Directions for the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures; together with some Observations for the confirming their Divine Authority, and illustrating the Difficulties thereof. By William Lowth B. D. Prebendary of *Winchester*.

The Christian briefly guided in the Path to Heaven. In four Parts. To which are added, Prayers suitable to Families, to private Christians and Youth: Recommended by a Minister to his Parishioners, especially the younger sort.





